

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/567,404	02/06/2006	Masahiko Igarashi	025416-00025	2541	
4372 ARENT FOX I	7590 08/27/2007 PLLC			EXAMINER	
1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.			GARCIA, ERNESTO		
SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	- ,		3679		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			08/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/567,404	IGARASHI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ernesto Garcia	3679				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/6/20	006.					
	<u> </u>					
	, —					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> are subject to restriction and/or e						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)	 □					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 3679

Election of Species

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

I. Figures 1-13

II. Figures 14-19

III. Figures 20-28

IV. Figures 29-31

V. Figures 32-37

Note that Figure 38 is directed to a process not claimed.

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 3679

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Claims 1-5 correspond to species I.
Claims 6 and 7 correspond to species II.
Claims 8-10 correspond to species III.
Claims 11 and 12 correspond to species IV.
Claims 13-17 correspond to species V.

The following claim(s) are generic: No claims are generic.

The recitation "said peak (28a) of said hub tooth section (28) has a second step region (32) retracted away from said shaft tooth section (22)" in claim 1, lines 17-19, precludes species IV. The recitation "said peak (28a) of said hub tooth section (28) has a step region (132) facing said arcuate region (130) and retracted away from said shaft tooth section (22)" in claim 6, lines 18-20, precludes species I. The recitation "said peak (28a) of said hub tooth section (28) has a step region (232) facing said tapered region (230) and retracted away from said shaft tooth section (22) in claim 8, lines 17-20, precludes species V. The recitation "said peak (28a) and said valley (28b) having constant inside diameters from the end toward said shaft shank in the axial direction of the shaft (12)" in claim 11, lines 13-16, precludes species I and II. The recitation "a straight peak (28a) ... having an inside diameter varying from an end thereof toward said shaft shank (24)" in claim 13, lines 10-13, precludes species IV.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

an assessment of the prior art with respect to the independent claims provides no unity of invention since the "special technical features", i.e., "said shaft tooth section (22) has a straight peak (22a) having a constant tooth thickness and a valley (22b) having an outside diameter varying from an end of the shaft toward a shaft shank (24) of the shaft (12)", "sad hub tooth section has a straight peak having a constant tooth thickness", and "a valley having a constant inside diameter in the axial direction of the shaft (12)", common in each of the independent claims, is known from patent publication, JP33-10508 and patent JP11-514079. Applicant should note that the lack of unity is based on a posteriori and the special technical features, common to all species, do not define a contribution over the prior.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Charles M. Marmelstein on June 1, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one

Application/Control Number: 10/567,404

Art Unit: 3679

or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim

remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by

a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ernesto Garcia whose telephone number is 571-272-

7083. The examiner can normally be reached from 9:30AM-6:00PM. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Daniel P. Stodola can be reached at 571-272-7087.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

E.G.

August 21, 2007

DANIEL P. STODOLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 5

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800